

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the following remarks and arguments, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-37 were originally presented for consideration in this application, and the Examiner's indication that Claims 2,7, 12-14 contain patentable subject matter is noted with appreciation.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11 and 15-37 currently stand rejected on the following grounds which are respectfully traversed for reasons subsequently set forth herein.

1. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 9-11, 15-17, 20-22, 25-29 and 32 currently stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,108,950 to Ruvang et al;
2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 15-17 currently stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by the published U.S. application 2003/0101627 of Robinson et al;
3. Claims 5, 18, 23 and 30 currently stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,108,950 to Ruvang et al in view of U.S. Patent 5,983,534 to Robinson et al; and
4. Claims 33-34 have been indicated as being rejected, but no grounds for such rejection have been set forth by the Examiner.

THE 35 USC §102(b) ANTICIPATION REJECTION OF
CLAIMS 1, 3, 4, 6, 9-11, 15-17, 20-22, 25-29 and 32
BASED ON U.S. PATENT 6,108,950 TO RUVANG et al

Via independent Claim 1, each of applicants' Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 9-11 and 15 specifies a lock member received in a body passage having a **polygonally shaped** side surface section that **circumscribes** the lock member. In contrast, the Ruvang et al side surface section 56a (see FIG. 5 in Ruvang et al) referred to by the Examiner is not **polygonally shaped** as required by these claims, and does not **circumscribe** the Ruvang et al lock member 38 as required by these claims. Accordingly, none of applicants' Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 9-11 and 15 is anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,108,950 to Ruvang et al.

Via independent Claim 16, each of applicants' Claims 16, 17 and 20 specifies a resilient detent member carried by a lock member and having a **periphery circumscribing said lock member**. The detent member 40 shown in Ruvang et al clearly does not have a periphery that circumscribes the lock member 38. Accordingly, none of applicants' Claims 16, 17 and 20 is anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,108,950 to Ruvang et al.

Via independent Claim 21, each of applicants' Claims 21, 22 and 25 specifies a lock member having a **slot** extending therethrough and opening outwardly through **opposite outer side surface portions** of the lock member, and a resilient detent member extending through said slot and having **opposite end portions** that project **outwardly beyond said outer side surface portions**. Clearly, neither of these claim limitations is present in the Ruvang et al structure - the lock member 38 does not have a slot that extends completely therethrough between opposite side surface portions thereof, and the detent member 40 does not have opposite end portions that project outwardly beyond such outer side surface portions.

Accordingly, none of applicants' Claims 21, 22 and 25 is anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,108,950 to Ruvang et al.

Via independent Claim 26, each of applicants' Claims 26-29 specifies a resilient detent member that has a periphery that **circumscribes** the recited lock member. In Ruvang et al, the detent member 40 clearly does not have a periphery which circumscribes the lock member 38. Accordingly, none of applicants' Claims 26-29 is anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,108,950 to Ruvang et al.

Claim 32 specifies that the recited lock member has a slot extending therethrough and opening outwardly through **opposite side surfaces** of the lock member, and a detent member extending through said slot and having **opposite end portions projecting outwardly beyond said outer side surface portions**. As discussed above relative to Claims 21, 22 and 25, the Ruvang et al reference does not disclose either of these claim limitations. Accordingly, Claim 32 is clearly not anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,108,905 to Ruvang et al.

THE 35 USC 102(e) ANTICIPATION REJECTION OF
CLAIMS 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 15-17, 19, 20-22, 25-29, 31 AND 32
BASED ON ROBINSON et al 2003/0101627

Via independent Claim 1, each of applicants' Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 15 specifies a lock member received in a body passage having a polygonally shaped side surface section that **circumscribes** the lock member. In contrast, the Robinson et al 2003/0101627 surface structure 75/78 referred to by the Examiner clearly does **not** circumscribe the lock member 18 as required by these claims - such surface structure 75/78 circumferentially extends only around a small circumferential portion the lock member 18. Accordingly, none of applicants' Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 15 is anticipated by Robinson et al 2003/0101627.

Via independent Claim 16, each of applicants' Claims 16, 17, 19 and 20 specifies a resilient detent member carried by a lock member and having a **periphery circumscribing said lock member**. Neither of the detent members shown in Robinson et al 2003/0101627 has a periphery that circumscribes the lock member on which they are carried. Accordingly, none of applicants' Claims 16, 17, 19 and 20 is anticipated by Robinson et al 2003/0101627.

Via independent Claim 21, each of applicants' Claims 21, 22, 24 and 25 specifies a lock member having a **slot** extending therethrough and opening outwardly through **opposite outer side surface portions** of the lock member, and a resilient detent member extending through said slot and having **opposite end portions** that project **outwardly beyond said outer side surface portions**. Clearly, neither of these claim limitations is present in the Robinson et al structure. Accordingly, none of applicants' Claims 21, 22, 24 and 25 is anticipated by Robinson et al 2003/0101627.

Via independent Claim 26, each of applicants' Claims 26-29 and 31 specifies a resilient detent member that has a periphery that **circumscribes** the recited lock member. Clearly, none of the detent members shown in Robinson et al 2003/0101627 has a periphery that circumscribes its associated lock member. Accordingly, none of applicants' Claims 26-29 and 31 is anticipated by Robinson et al 2003/0101627.

As discussed above, Claim 32 specifies that the recited lock member has a slot extending therethrough and opening outwardly through **opposite side surfaces** of the lock member, and a detent member extending through said slot and having **opposite end portions projecting outwardly beyond said outer side surface portions**. Robinson et al 2003/0101627 clearly fails to disclose either of these claim

limitations. Accordingly, Claim 32 is not anticipated by Robinson et al 2003/0101627.

THE 35 USC §103(a) REJECTION OF
DEPENDENT CLAIMS 5, 18, 23 AND 30 BASED ON
U.S. PATENT 6,108,950 TO RUVANG et al IN VIEW OF
U.S. PATENT 5,983,534 TO ROBINSON et al

Claim 5 specifies a lock member received in a body passage having a polygonally shaped side surface section that **circumscribes** the lock member. As discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1, U.S. Patent 6,108,950 to Ruvang et al fails to disclose these claim limitations. These deficiencies in Ruvang et al are in no manner cured by U.S. Patent 5,983,534 to Robinson et al. Specifically, the FIG. 2 surface section 44 in Robinson et al referred to by the Examiner clearly does **not** circumscribe the lock member 64. Accordingly, Claim 5 is not rendered obvious by the Ruvang et al/Robinson et al reference combination proposed by the Examiner.

Claim 18 specifies a resilient detent member carried by a lock member and having a **periphery circumscribing said lock member**. Neither U.S. Patent 6,108,950 to Ruvang et al nor U.S. Patent 5,983,534 to Robinson et al discloses this claim limitation. Specifically no detent member in either of these two references discloses a detent member having a periphery that circumscribes its associated lock member. Accordingly, Claim 18 is not rendered obvious by the Ruvang et al/Robinson et al reference combination proposed by the Examiner.

Claim 23 specifies a lock member having a **slot** extending therethrough and opening outwardly through **opposite outer side surface portions** of the lock member, and a resilient detent member

extending through said slot and having **opposite end portions** that project **outwardly beyond said outer side surface portions**. Neither U.S. Patent 6,108,950 to Ruvang et al nor U.S. Patent 5,983,534 to Robinson et al discloses either of these claim limitations. Accordingly, Claim 23 is not rendered obvious by the Ruvang et al/Robinson et al reference combination proposed by the Examiner.

Claim 30 specifies a resilient detent member that has a periphery that **circumscribes** the recited lock member. As discussed above, neither U.S. Patent 6,108,950 to Ruvang et al nor U.S. Patent 5,983,534 to Robinson et al discloses this claim limitation. Accordingly, Claim 30 is not rendered obvious by the Ruvang et al/Robinson et al reference combination proposed by the Examiner.

THE REJECTION OF DEPENDENT CLAIMS 33-37

No grounds have been set forth for rejecting these claims, each of which depends from independent Claim 32, discussed above, which specifies that the recited lock member has a slot extending therethrough and opening outwardly through **opposite side surfaces** of the lock member, and a detent member extending through said slot and having **opposite end portions projecting outwardly beyond said outer side surface portions**. None of the three references currently being applied by the Examiner discloses or suggests either of these claim limitations. It is thus respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 33-37 are patentably distinguishable over all of the art currently being applied by the Examiner.

THE OBJECTED-TO CLAIMS 2, 7 AND 12-14

Because of their dependency from clearly allowable independent Claims, these objected-to claims are seen to be in a condition for allowance without modification thereof.

In view of the foregoing remarks and arguments, all of the claims currently pending in this application are now seen to be in a condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance of Claims 1-37 is therefore earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is hereby requested to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at 972/516-0030 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the instant application.

Respectfully submitted,

KONNEKER & SMITH, P.C.



J. Richard Konneker
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 28,867

Dated: October 13, 2005

660 N. Central Expwy., #230
Plano, Texas 75074
972/516-0030

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450,

on October 13, 2005
Diane Sutton